| 1 | THOMAS E. FRANKOVICH (State Bar No. 074414) THOMAS E. FRANKOVICH, A Professional Law Corporation 2806 Van Ness Avenue San Francisco, CA 94109 Telephone: 415/674-8600 Facsimile: 415/674-9900 | | |
|----|---|------------------------------------|--|
| 2 | | | |
| 3 | | | |
| 4 | | | |
| 5 | Attorneys for Plaintiffs CRAIG YATES and DISABILITY RIGHTS ENFORCEMENT, EDUCATION SERVICES | | |
| 6 | | | |
| 7 | RICHARD E. MORTON (State Bar No. 541 | 88) | |
| 8 | RICHARD E. MORTON HAIGHT BROWN & BONESTEEL LLP 5 Hutton Centre Drive Suite 900 Santa Ana, CA 92707 | | |
| 9 | | | |
| 10 | | | |
| 11 | Attorneys for Defendants LEVIN COMMERCIAL FACILITY; STUART M. LEVIN, trustee of the STUART M. LEVIN REVOCABLE TRUST, | | |
| 12 | | | |
| 13 | | | |
| 14 | | | |
| 15 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | | |
| 16 | NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | | |
| 17 | CRAIG YATES, an individual; and) DISABILITY RIGHTS ENFORCEMENT,) | CASE NO. CV-07-6498-WHA | |
| 18 | EDUCATION, SERVICES: HELPING) YOU HELP OTHERS, a California public) | JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT | |
| 19 | benefit corporation,) | Date: | June 12, 2008 |
| 20 | Plaintiffs,) | Time: Judge: | 11:00 a.m. Honorable William |
| 21 | V.) LEVIN COMMERCIAL FACILITY;) STUART M. LEVIN, trustee of the) | Courtroom: Location: | Alsup Courtroom 9, 19 th Floor 450 Golden Gate Ave San Francisco, CA |
| 22 | | | |
| 23 | STUART M. LEVIN REVOCABLE () TRUST, () | Telephone: | 415/ 522-2020 |
| 24 | Defendant. | | |
| 25 |) | | |
| 26 | The parties to the above-captioned action jointly submit this Case Management Statement. | | |
| 27 | | | |
| 28 | | | |
| | | | |

1. JURISDICTION, VENUE & SERVICE

Jurisdiction: This Court has jurisdiction of this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1331 for violations of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. §12101, *et seq*. Pursuant to supplemental jurisdiction, attendant and related causes of action, arising from the same nucleus of operative facts and arising out of the same transactions, are also brought under parallel California law, whose goals are closely tied with the ADA, including but not limited to violations of California Civil Code §51, *et seq.* and § 54, *et seq.*, California Health & Safety Code §19955 *et seq.*, including §19959; and Title 24, California Building Standards Code.

Venue: Venue is proper in this court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1391(b) and is founded on the facts that the real property which is the subject of this action is located in this district at/near Novato, California, and that plaintiffs' causes of action arose in this district.

Status of Service of Process:

All parties to the action have been served.

2. BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF CASE/FACTS

This is an action brought by plaintiffs for discrimination based upon the defendants' alleged failure to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA), 42 U.S.C. §12101, et seq., the Unruh Civil Rights Act, Cal. Civ. Code §§51 and 51.5, California Health & Safety Code §19955, et seq., and the California Disabled Persons Act, Cal. Civ. Code §§54, 54.1 and 54.3, all of which relate to the denial of access to a place of public accommodation.

Plaintiff CRAIG YATES is a person with a disability. Plaintiff visited LEVIN COMMERCIAL FACILITY, Christopher's Café, a place of public accommodation, on several occasions. While at Christopher's Café, plaintiff allegedly encountered several architectural barriers to access, including a lack of directional signage to show accessible routes of travel, i.e., entrances; lack of the requisite type and number of disabled parking stall(s); lack of

///

///

///

28 ///

disabled van accessible parking stall(s); lack of an accessible entrances to Christopher's Café, Marin Carpet Service, Daniel Black Stone Financial Planning, Bonder Systems, Rachel Casrejohn, Attorney at Law and DiGiorigio Contracting; lack of accessible paths of travel (smooth hard packed surfaces) to: Christopher's Café, Marin Carpet Service, Daniel Black Stone Financial Planning, Bonder Systems, Rachel Casrejohn, Attorney at Law and DiGiorigio Contracting', lack of an accessible dining area; 5% compliance requirement; lack of a clear path of travel to the unisex restroom at Christopher's due to the placement of tables and chairs too close together, which prevents wheelchair access to the restroom; lack of a handicapped-accessible unisex public restroom at Christopher's; lack of an accessible entrance to the patio dining at Christopher's;

Plaintiffs allege that the existence of these architectural barriers constitutes violations of plaintiffs' civil rights under federal and state law, and caused plaintiff CRAIG YATES to suffer actual harm at the hands of defendants.

3. PRINCIPAL LEGAL ISSUES IN DISPUTE

- a. whether architectural barriers existed and/or continue to exist at LEVIN COMMERCIAL FACILITY, Christopher's Café which denied access to persons with disabilities;
- b. whether the removal of architectural barriers is readily achievable;
- c. whether defendants made alterations and modifications to LEVIN
 COMMERCIAL FACILITY, Christopher's Café which trigger compliance
 with certain State and federal disability access standards; and
- d. whether and to what extent plaintiff CRAIG YATES suffered actual damages at the hands of defendants.

24 ///

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

4. **MOTIONS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

If settlement efforts are unsuccessful, plaintiffs anticipate bringing a motion for summary judgment on this issue of defendants' liability.

5. **AMENDMENT OF PLEADINGS**

None anticipated at this time.

6. EVIDENCE PRESERVATION

No issues anticipated.

7. **DISCLOSURES**

The parties have served their initial disclosures of evidence pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P.

26. These disclosures included identification of known percipient witnesses, and production of receipts from the subject public accommodation, pre-filing correspondence from plaintiff

CRAIG YATES to the owner of LEVIN COMMERCIAL FACILITY and operator of

Christopher's Café, and photographs of the Café taken by plaintiff.

8. **DISCOVERY**

The parties request that the permissible number of interrogatories be increased to fifty (50) per party. Discovery shall otherwise be conducted pursuant to the limitations set-forth in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

9. **CLASS ACTION**

Not Applicable.

10. RELATED CASES

21 None.

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

///

28

11. RELIEF

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Plaintiffs seek injunctive relief to compel defendant to make its public accommodation accessible pursuant to ADAAG or Title 24, whichever is more restrictive, and to further maintain access in the future. Plaintiffs also seek actual and statutory damages and attorneys' fees, including litigation expenses and costs.

12. SETTLEMENT/ADR

The ADR process to which the parties jointly request referral is court-sponsored mediation.

13. MAGISTRATE JUDGE TRIALS

Plaintiffs would consent to reassignment to a Magistrate Judge for trial purposes.

14. OTHER REFERENCES

Not applicable.

15. NARROWING OF ISSUES

Plaintiffs believe that the issue of defendants' liability can be decided on motion to the Court.

16. EXPEDITED SCHEDULE

Not applicable.

17. SCHEDULING

Disclosure of Expert Witness: October 22, 2008

Discovery Cut-off: February 2, 2009

Last Day to Hear Motions: February 26, 2009

Final Pretrial Conference: May 11, 2009

Trial Date: June 22, 2009

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

28